REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 9, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia,* "wherein the modifying at least one byte of the first data message includes adding the first message modification key byte value to multiple data bytes of the first data message." Labaton was relied upon for allegedly disclosing adding the first message modification key value to at least one data byte of the first data message. Applicant submits that Labaton fails to teach "adding the first message modification key byte value to multiple data bytes of the first data message" as recited in claim 1.

Labaton teaches a function for encoding credit card numbers which utilizes significantly more mathematics than that recited in claim 1. Labaton teaches a function in which a natural logarithm is taken of certain date and time elements, which are then added to a natural logarithm of the credit card number (column 9, lines 1-60). This processing does not correspond to the adding of byte values recited in claim 1. Labaton makes no reference to adding of byte values, but rather teaches using natural logarithm functions to perform the encryption and decryption. Even if Bianchi and Labaton are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton. Claims 2-4 and 6-10 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 11 and 21, as amended, recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 12-15, 19 and 20 depend from claim 11 and are considered patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton and Kamperman. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Kamperman was relied upon for disclosing transmitting modified data messages, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Bianchi in view of Labaton discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1 and claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 11, and are patentable over Bianchi in view of Labaton and Kamperman for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claims 1 and 11.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: October 9, 2007